

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed May 24, 2004. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-30 and 32-34, and objects to Claim 31. Claims 1, 6, 12, 13, 15, 25, and 31 have been amended to clarify, more particularly point out, and more distinctly claim inventive concepts previously present in these claims. Applicants make no admission that these amendments narrow the scope of the claims or that the amendments are required for patentability. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Telephone Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy and opportunity to conduct the telephone interview on July 19, 2004. In the telephone interview, Applicants proposed an amendment to further clarify what the Applicants consider to be the invention. The Examiner made some very helpful suggestions, but no agreement was reached. Applicants thank the Examiner for the suggestions.

Objected to Claims

The Examiner objected to Claim 31 for being unclear, but indicated that Claim 31 would be allowable if amended to overcome the objection. (Office Action, page 2, paragraphs 2-3.) Claim 31 has been amended according to the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 31.

Section 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 6, 10-11, 15-16, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,009,429 to Greer, et al. ("*Greer*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and any statements therein for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Greer* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, the elements specifically recited in Applicants' claims, as amended. For example, *Greer* fails

to disclose, teach, or suggest a director “residing at a client system” and operable to “provide web browsing capabilities by pulling a plurality of web pages from a channel server,” as recited in independent Claims 1, 6, and 15, as amended.

As the Examiner states, the director of *Greer* is a “server-side director.” (Office Action, page 11, paragraph 28.) As discussed in a previous response by Applicants, *Greer* discloses a guided tour of a portion of the web. *Greer* specifies that the tour may work “as part of an ordinary web page” and “can be served by any web server.” (*Greer*, Abstract.) In addition, the tour disclosed in *Greer* relies upon Netscape Navigator as a web browser director. (See, e.g., Figure 2.) Moreover, to initiate the tour of *Greer*, a web server needs to be accessed. (Column 3, lines 39-43.) That is, the tour of *Greer* is directed to a web server director that resides at a server and that provides pages to a web browser, but not to a web browser director that resides at a client system and that pulls pages from a web server. Consequently, at a minimum, *Greer* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a director “residing at a client system” and operable to “provide web browsing capabilities by pulling a plurality of web pages from a channel server,” as recited in independent Claims 1, 6, and 15, as amended. For at least these reasons, *Greer* fails to disclose the elements specifically recited in Claims 1, 6, and 15.

Applicants’ dependent Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 16, and 32 are allowable based on their dependence on the independent claims and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the reference relied upon by the Examiner. Because Applicants believe they have amply demonstrated the allowability of the independent claims over the reference relied upon by the Examiner, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicants have not provided detailed remarks concerning these dependent claims. Applicants, however, remain ready to provide such remarks if it becomes appropriate to do so.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 1, 6, and 15 and Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 16, and 32 that depend on these claims.

Section 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejects under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 4 and 17-18 as being unpatentable over *Greer* in view of *Nobakht*; Claims 5, 25-30, and 34 as being unpatentable over *Greer*; and Claims 7-9, 12-14, 19-24, and 33 as being unpatentable over *Greer* in view

of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,001 to Walker et al. ("*Walker*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and any assertions therein for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the specific combinations of references as suggested by the Examiner fail to disclose, teach, or suggest elements specifically recited in Applicants' claims. For the reasons discussed above, *Greer*, even in combination with *Walker*, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, a "director residing at a client system" and operable to "provide web browsing capabilities by pulling a plurality of web pages from a channel server," as recited in independent Claims 1, 6, 12, 15, and 25, as amended. For at least this reason, the combinations suggested by the Examiner fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements specifically recited in independent Claims 1, 6, 12, 15, and 25.

Moreover, the *Greer-Walker* combination suggested by the Examiner does not disclose, teach, or suggest, "preventing the user from requesting a third web page distinct from the first and second web pages by preventing the user from providing at least a portion of a uniform resource locator associated with the third web page," as recited in independent Claims 12 and 25, as amended. *Walker* discloses a "browser capable of accessing only web pages previously authorized by a parent or supervisor of a user of the browser." (*Walker*, Abstract.) According to *Walker*:

In a supervisor mode of operation, a parent can browse through any accessible web site and continually add approved web sites to a database of authorized web sites. Later, in a user mode of operation, the child is capable of accessing only those web sites that have been added to the authorized web site database.

(*Walker*, Abstract.) That is, *Walker* prevents a user from accessing a web site by creating a database of authorized web sites and allowing access only to the authorized web sites. *Walker*, however, does not disclose, teach, or suggest, "preventing the user from requesting a third web page distinct from the first and second web pages by preventing the user from providing at least a portion of a uniform resource locator associated with the third web page," as recited in amended Claims 12 and 25. For at least this reason, the *Greer-Walker* combination suggested by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements specifically recited in Claims 12 and 25.

Applicants' dependent Claims 4, 5, 7-9, 13, 14, 17-24, 26-30, 33, and 34 are allowable based on their dependence on the independent claims and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the combinations of references

suggested by the Examiner. Because Applicants believe they have amply demonstrated the allowability of the independent claims over the combinations of references suggested by the Examiner, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicants have not provided detailed remarks concerning these dependent claims. Applicants, however, remain ready to provide such remarks if it becomes appropriate to do so.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 4, 5, 7-9, 12-14, 17-30, and 32-34.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although no fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

Date: July 23, 2004

Correspondence Address:

Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6494

Customer No. 05073